arXiv:1402.5842v1 [math.AP] 24 Feb 2014

A WEAK SPACE-TIME FORMULATION FOR THE LINEAR STOCHASTIC HEAT EQUATION

STIG LARSSON AND MATTEO MOLTENI

Abstract. We apply the well-known Banach-Nečas-Babuška inf-sup theory in a stochastic setting to introduce a weak space-time formulation of the linear stochastic heat equation with additive noise. Both trial and test functions have a stochastic component. We give sufficient conditions on the the data and on the covariance operator associated to the driving Wiener process, in order to have existence and uniqueness of the solution. We also show the relation of the obtained solution to the so-called mild solution and to the variational solution of the same problem. The spatial regularity of the solution is also discussed. Two possible semidiscretizations, first a spatial approximation based on a standard finite element method, then a temporal approximation, based on continuous piecewise linear test functions and piecewise constant trial functions, are finally introduced. Error estimates in terms of the best error and of the quasi-optimality constant are presented for both semidiscretizations.

1. Introduction

We consider a linear parabolic stochastic evolution problem of the form

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{d}U(t) + A(t)U(t)\,\mathrm{d}t = f(t)\,\mathrm{d}t + \mathrm{d}W(t), \quad t \in (0,T], \\ &U(0) = U_0. \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

We assume that $A(t)$ is a random elliptic operator defined within a Gelfand triple setting as follows. Given separable Hilbert spaces V, H, consider a Gelfand triple $V \subset H \subset V^*$, where V is continuously and densely embedded into H. Denote with $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_H$ the inner product in H and with ${}_{V^*}\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_V$ the dual pairing between V and V^*, where $\langle u,v\rangle_H = {}_{V^*}\langle u,v\rangle_V$, $\forall u \in H, v \in V$. Let $T \in (0,\infty)$ be fixed and let $(\Omega,\Sigma,\mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space, with normal filtration $\Sigma = (\Sigma_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$.

We assume that a progressively measurable map $A\colon [0,T]\times\Omega\times V \to V^*$, coercive and bounded $\mathrm{d}t\otimes\mathbb{P}$-a.s., is given, with associated bilinear form a given by $a(t,\omega;u,v) = {}_{V^*}\langle A(t,\omega)u, v\rangle_V$. We consider a predictable process with Bochner integrable trajectories $f \in L^2(\Omega\times[0,T];V^*)$ and we assume that $W = (W(t))_{t\in[0,T]}$ is a Q-Wiener process, with covariance operator $Q \in \mathscr{L}(H,H)$ such that $Q^{\frac12}$ is Hilbert-Schmidt from H to V^*, i.e., $Q^{\frac12} \in \mathscr{L}_2(H,V^*)$.

In order to give a meaning to the expression in (1.1), we have to define what we mean with "solution". In the special case when A is independent of t and ω and considered as unbounded operator in H, we have the concepts of *weak* and *mild solution*, see [DPZ92].

Date: February 25, 2014.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60H15, 35R60, 65M60.

Key words and phrases. Inf-sup theory, stochastic heat equation, Petrov-Galerkin, finite element, Crank-Nicolson, quasi-optimality.

Definition 1 (Weak and mild solution)**.** *Let the operator A be possibly unbounded, independent of ω and t and defined on a certain domain $D(A)$, i.e., $A : D(A) \subset H \to H$. A weak solution to* (1.1) *is an H-valued, predictable stochastic process $U(t)$ which is Bochner integrable $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. and satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}\langle U(t), v\rangle_H = \langle U_0, v\rangle_H - \int_0^t \langle U(s), A^* v\rangle_H \,\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \langle f(s), v\rangle_H \,\mathrm{d}s \\ + \int_0^t \langle \,\mathrm{d}W(s), v\rangle_H, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s., } \forall v \in D(A^*),\, t \in [0,T].\end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

Moreover, if $-A$ is the generator a strongly continuous semigroup $(S(t))_{t\geq 0}$ in H and $\int_0^T \|S(s)Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2_{\mathscr{L}_2(H)} \,\mathrm{d}s < \infty$, then the unique weak solution coincides with the mild solution, given by the formula

$$U(t) = S(t)U_0 + \int_0^t S(t-s)f(s)\,\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t S(t-s)\,\mathrm{d}W(s), \quad t \in [0,T]. \tag{1.3}$$

We briefly recall how to switch from the Gelfand triple framework to the semigroup framework in Appendix A. Within the semigroup framework it is possible to prove results about about spatial regularity and temporal Hölder-continuity of the solution, by defining Sobolev spaces of fractional order, $\dot{H}^\beta := D(A^{\frac{\beta}{2}})$, and exploiting the semigroup theory. For example, in the parabolic case, when the semigroup is analytic, it was shown in [Yan04] that if $U_0 \in L^2(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)$, $f = 0$, and $\|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathscr{L}_2(H)} < \infty$ for some $\beta \geq 0$, then the mild solution satisfies

$$\|U(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega;\dot{H}^\beta)} \leq C\Big(\|U_0\|_{L^2(\Omega;\dot{H}^\beta)} + \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathscr{L}_2(H)}\Big), \quad t \in [0,T]. \tag{1.4}$$

The concept of mild solution presents however the disadvantage of not being applicable whenever the operator does not generate a semigroup. This fact provides a good reason to look for more general concepts of solution that do not rely at all on such a theory.

The aim of this paper is to introduce a new concept of solution based on a weak variational formulation of the problem. In order to prove the mild solution formula (1.3), [DPZ92] proceeds from the space-time weak formulation (1.2) with time-independent deterministic test functions, to a weak formulation with time-dependent deterministic test functions,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle U(t), v(t)\rangle_H = \langle U_0, v(0)\rangle_H + \int_0^t \langle U(s), \dot{v}(s) - A^* v(s)\rangle_H \,\mathrm{d}s \\ + \int_0^t \langle f(s), v(s)\rangle_H \,\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \langle \,\mathrm{d}W(s), v(s)\rangle_H.\end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

This suggests the possibility of using a weak space-time formulation, which would be to find a pair (U_1, U_2) such that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^t \langle U_1(s), -\dot{v}(s) + A^* v(s)\rangle_H \,\mathrm{d}s + \langle U_2, v(t)\rangle_H \\ = \langle U_0, v(0)\rangle_H + \int_0^t \langle f(s), v(s)\rangle_H \,\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \langle \,\mathrm{d}W(s), v(s)\rangle_H,\end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

for all v in a suitable class of test functions.

With a proper choice of function spaces, the well-posedness of this problem in the deterministic setting is obtained within the Banach-Nečas-Babuška inf-sup theory,

see Section 2 below. In Section 3 we extend this to the stochastic evolution problem (1.1). It turns out that we need to use stochastic trial and test functions and further integrate the equation over Ω. The inf-sup theory then provides existence, uniqueness and a bound in terms of the data U_0, f, and of the covariance operator Q. In particular, under suitable assumptions, our solution coincides with the mild solution. Moreover, we obtain the same regularity estimate as in (1.4), but with an additional term $(\int_0^t \|U(s)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega;\dot{H}^{\beta+1})}\,\mathrm{d}s)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ on the left-hand side, which cannot be obtained by the semigroup approach.

A more general solution concept is the so-called *variational solution*, for which a comprehensive theory can be found, for example, in [PR07, Chapt. 4].

Definition 2 (Variational solution)**.** *Assume that Q is trace class, i.e., $Q^{\frac{1}{2}} \in \mathscr{L}_2(H,H)$. A continuous H-valued Σ-adapted process $(U(t))_{t\in[0,T]}$ is called a variational solution to* (1.1)*, if for its $\mathrm{d}t\otimes\mathbb{P}$ equivalence class $\hat{U}$ we have $\hat{U}\in L^2(\Omega\times[0,T],\mathrm{d}t\otimes\mathbb{P};V)$ and $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.*

$$U(t) = U_0 - \int_0^t A(s)\bar{U}(s)\,\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t f(s)\,\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \mathrm{d}W(s), \tag{1.7}$$

for any $t\in[0,T]$, where $\bar{U}$ is any V-valued progressively measurable $\mathrm{d}t\otimes\mathbb{P}$ version of $\hat{U}$.

We show that our solution coincides with such a solution.

Moreover, the weak space-time formulation is a natural basis for Petrov-Galerkin approximations. In Section 6 we sketch two possible semidiscretizations, one with respect to the spatial variables and one with respect to the time variable. A priori estimates based on the quasi-optimality theory are obtained. We do not discuss the approximation of the stochastic dimension.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **The inf-sup theory.** We recall the Banach-Nečas-Babuška (BNB) theorem, see for example [BA72, EG04]. Let V and W be Banach spaces, W reflexive, and consider a bounded bilinear form $\mathscr{B}\colon V\times W\to\mathbb{R}$, with

$$C_B := \sup_{0\neq w\in W}\sup_{0\neq v\in V}\frac{\mathscr{B}(v,w)}{\|v\|_V\|w\|_W} < \infty, \tag{BDD}$$

and the associated bounded linear operator $B\colon W\to V^*$, i.e., $B\in\mathscr{L}(W,V^*)$, defined by

$${}_V\langle v, Bw\rangle_{V^*} := \mathscr{B}(v,w),\ \forall w\in W, \forall v\in V.$$

The operator B is boundedly invertible if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:

$$c_B := \inf_{0\neq w\in W}\sup_{0\neq v\in V}\frac{\mathscr{B}(v,w)}{\|v\|_V\|w\|_W} > 0, \tag{BNB1}$$

$$\forall v\in V,\quad \sup_{0\neq w\in W}\mathscr{B}(v,w) > 0. \tag{BNB2}$$

The constant c_B is called the inf-sup constant and, whenever both V and W are reflexive and (BNB1) holds, we have the identity

$$\inf_{0\neq w\in W}\sup_{0\neq v\in V}\frac{\mathscr{B}(v,w)}{\|v\|_V\|w\|_W} = \inf_{0\neq v\in V}\sup_{0\neq w\in W}\frac{\mathscr{B}(v,w)}{\|v\|_V\|w\|_W}, \tag{2.1}$$

which allows to swap the spaces where the infimum and the supremum are taken.

An immediate consequence of this is that the variational problem

$$w \in W\colon \mathscr{B}(v,w) = F(v), \quad \forall v \in V, \quad F \in V^*, \tag{2.2}$$

i.e., $Bw = F$ in V^*, and its adjoint

$$v \in V\colon \mathscr{B}(v,w) = G(w), \quad \forall w \in W, \quad G \in W^*, \tag{2.3}$$

i.e., $B^*v = G$ in W^*, are well-posed whenever (BDD), (BNB1) and (BNB2) hold. In particular, the well-posedness of the former is equivalent to the well-posedness of the latter and the norms of the solutions are bounded, respectively, by

$$\|w\|_W \leq \frac{1}{c_B}\|F\|_{V^*}, \quad \|v\|_V \leq \frac{1}{c_B}\|G\|_{W^*}.$$

It is then possible to consider the same variational problem on some families of proper subspaces ${}^sW \subset W$ and ${}^sV \subset V$, to obtain a Petrov-Galerkin approximation:

$$\bar{w} \in {}^sW\colon \mathscr{B}(v,\bar{w}) = F(v), \quad \forall v \in {}^sV, \quad F \in W^*. \tag{2.4}$$

Despite the fact that the hypothesis (BDD) is trivially fulfilled, it does not follow immediately that the analogous inf-sup conditions hold on the subspaces. Thus, one has to prove that

$$c_B^s := \inf_{0\neq w\in {}^sW} \sup_{0\neq v\in {}^sV} \frac{\mathscr{B}(v,w)}{\|v\|_V\|w\|_W} > 0, \tag{BNB1d}$$

$$\forall v \in {}^sV, \quad \sup_{0\neq w\in {}^sW} \mathscr{B}(v,w) > 0, \tag{BNB2d}$$

in order to obtain well-posedness of the new variational problem.

The inf-sup constant c_B^s might now depend on the choice of the subspaces, and, in particular, it might not be positive uniformly in s. It is therefore important, in view of its key role for the quasi-optimality of error estimates, to be able to bound it from below with an absolute constant $\tilde{c}_B > 0$. Notice also that in the case of finite-dimensional subspaces, with $\dim({}^sW) = \dim({}^sV)$, the two conditions (BNB1d) and (BNB2d) are equivalent.

Provided the existence and uniqueness of solutions w and $\bar{w}$, respectively, to the variational problems (2.2) and (2.4), it is possible to exploit the well-known quasi-optimality theory, where the error is estimated in terms of the best error and the quasi-optimality constant q for the couple of subspaces used, where q is defined as the smallest positive constant such that

$$\|w - \bar{w}\|_W \leq q \inf_{u\in {}^sW} \|w - u\|_W.$$

A first result in this direction was presented in [BA72]: in the setting described above q can be bounded by $1+\frac{C_B}{\tilde{c}_B}$. Later in [XZ03] this was sharpened by exploiting the properties of idempotent operators on Hilbert spaces. They showed that when W is a Hilbert space,

$$q \leq \frac{C_B}{\tilde{c}_B}.$$

Some other generalizations and improvements can actually be achieved: we refer to [Tan13], where the author presents several extensions, covering also the non-conforming case.

2.2. **The inf-sup theory applied to an abstract parabolic problem.** In recent years there has been a renewed interest for the tools presented above in order to deal with the linear heat equation (see, for example, [BJ89, CDD$^+$11, CS11, SS09, SS11, Tan13, UP12]), starting from an abstract parabolic equation given in the Gelfand triple framework. Assume indeed that Hilbert spaces V, H are given, forming a Gelfand triple $V \hookrightarrow H \hookrightarrow V^*$, $T > 0$, and a bilinear form

$$a(\cdot\,;\cdot,\cdot)\colon [0,T] \times V \times V \to \mathbb{R},$$

satisfying the following conditions for some positive numbers α, M_a:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{(Boundedness)} && |a(t;u,v)| \le M_a \|u\|_V \|v\|_V, && t \in [0,T], u, v \in V,\\ &\text{(Coercivity)} && a(t;v,v) \ge \alpha \|v\|_V^2, && t \in [0,T], v \in V. \end{aligned}$$

For every $t \in [0,T]$, let $A(t)$ be the bounded linear operator from V to V^* associated with the bilinear form, i.e., $A(t) \in \mathcal{L}(V, V^*)$ and

$${}_{V^*}\langle A(t)u, v\rangle_V = a(t;u,v) = {}_V\langle u, A^*(t)v\rangle_{V^*}.$$

Consider now the problem

$$\begin{aligned} &\dot u(t) + A(t)u(t) = f(t) && \text{in } V^*,\ t \in (0,T],\\ &u(0) = u_0 && \text{in } H, \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

where $\dot u(t)$ denotes the derivative of u with respect to t, i.e., $\dot u(t) := \frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\mathrm{d}t}$. Define the Lebesgue-Bochner spaces

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Y} &= L^2([0,T];V),\\ \mathcal{X} &= L^2([0,T];V) \cap H^1((0,T);V^*), \end{aligned}$$

normed by

$$\begin{aligned} \|y\|_{\mathcal{Y}}^2 &= \|y\|_{L^2([0,T];V)}^2 = \int_0^T \|y(t)\|_V^2 \,\mathrm{d}t,\\ \|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 &= \|x\|_{L^2([0,T];V)}^2 + \|\dot x\|_{L^2([0,T];V^*)}^2 = \int_0^T \|x(t)\|_V^2 + \|\dot x(t)\|_{V^*}^2 \,\mathrm{d}t. \end{aligned}$$

By means of the trace theorem $\mathcal{X}$ is densely embedded in $\mathscr{C}([0,T];H)$ and there exists a constant M_e, uniform in the choice of V, such that

$$M_e := \sup_{0 \ne x \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{\|x(t)\|_{\mathscr{C}([0,T];H)}}{\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}} < \infty. \tag{2.6}$$

Moreover, whenever $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$, integration by parts is possible:

$$\int_0^T \Big({}_{V^*}\langle \dot x(t), y(t)\rangle_V + {}_V\langle x(t), \dot y(t)\rangle_{V^*} \Big) \,\mathrm{d}t = \langle x(T), y(T)\rangle_H - \langle x(0), y(0)\rangle_H.$$

The reader can refer to [DL92] for a comprehensive presentation of these spaces.

A possible approach to solving the differential problem (2.5) is presented for example in [SS09] and it consists in integrating in time the dual pairing between the equation and a test function $y_1 \in \mathcal{Y}$ and taking the inner product between the

initial condition and another test vector $y_2 \in H$, thus obtaining the following two equations:

$$\int_0^T \Big({}_{V^*}\langle \dot{u}(t), y_1(t)\rangle_V + a(t; u(t), y_1(t)) \Big)\,\mathrm{d}t = \int_0^T {}_{V^*}\langle f(t), y_1(t)\rangle_V \,\mathrm{d}t,$$
$$\langle u(0), y_2\rangle_H = \langle u_0, y_2\rangle_H.$$

Adding and defining $\mathcal{Y}_H := \mathcal{Y} \times H$, Hilbert space normed by its product norm, gives the variational problem

$$u \in \mathcal{X} : \mathscr{B}(u, y) = \mathscr{F}(y), \quad \forall y = (y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{Y}_H, \tag{2.7}$$

where the following bilinear and linear forms are used

$$\mathscr{B}\colon \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}_H \to \mathbb{R},$$
$$\mathscr{B}(x, y) := \int_0^T \Big({}_{V^*}\langle \dot{x}(t), y_1(t)\rangle_V + a(t; x(t), y_1(t)) \Big)\,\mathrm{d}t + \langle x(0), y_2\rangle_H,$$
$$\mathscr{F}\colon \mathcal{Y}_H \to \mathbb{R},$$
$$\mathscr{F}(y) := \int_0^T {}_{V^*}\langle f(t), y_1(t)\rangle_V \,\mathrm{d}t + \langle u_0, y_2\rangle_H.$$

We call this the *first* space-time variational formulation of (2.5). Notice that this is not the only possible way to include the initial condition in the variational formulation, but it will turn out to be the most suitable in our analysis.

Consider now the backward adjoint problem to (2.5):

$$\begin{aligned} -\dot{v}(t) + A^*(t)v(t) &= g(t) \quad \text{in } V^*,\ t \in [0, T), \\ v(T) &= v_T \qquad\qquad\ \text{in } H, \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

whose *first* space-time variational formulation is given by

$$v \in \mathcal{X} : \mathscr{B}^*(y, v) = \mathscr{G}(y), \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}_H. \tag{2.9}$$

Here the bilinear form is given by

$$\mathscr{B}^*\colon \mathcal{Y}_H \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R},$$
$$\mathscr{B}^*(y, x) := \int_0^T \Big({}_{V}\langle y_1(t), -\dot{x}(t)\rangle_{V^*} + a(t; y_1(t), x(t)) \Big)\,\mathrm{d}t + \langle y_2, x(T)\rangle_H, \tag{2.10}$$

and the load functional by

$$\mathscr{G}\colon \mathcal{Y}_H \to \mathbb{R},$$
$$\mathscr{G}(y) := \int_0^T {}_{V^*}\langle g(t), y_1(t)\rangle_V \,\mathrm{d}t + \langle y_2, v_T\rangle_H.$$

By defining a new load functional

$$\mathscr{F}\colon \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R},$$
$$\mathscr{F}(x) := \int_0^T {}_{V^*}\langle f(t), x(t)\rangle_V \,\mathrm{d}t + \langle u_0, x(0)\rangle_H,$$

and interchanging the roles of trial and test spaces, the *second* (or *weak*) space-time formulation of the original problem (2.5) is obtained:

$$u = (u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{Y}_H : \mathscr{B}^*(u, x) = \mathscr{F}(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}. \tag{2.11}$$

If a solution of (2.11) has the additional regularity $u_1 \in \mathcal{X}$, then an integration by parts shows that u_1 is a solution of the first problem (2.7) and that $u_2 = u_1(T)$. In this case the second component of the solution, u_2, can be understood as a continuous H-valued version of u_1, evaluated at time $t = T$. Therefore, u_2 is redundant and in other works the weak space-time formulation is

$$u \in \mathcal{Y} : \mathscr{B}^*(u, x) = \mathscr{F}(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_{0,T} := \{x \in \mathcal{X} : x(T) = 0\}. \tag{2.12}$$

However, in the present work we found it useful to keep u_2.

Notice that the first and the second formulations are related and the well-posedness of the former is equivalent to the well-posedness of the latter. It holds (using a suitable modification of the proofs in [SS09, Tan13]) that

$$C_B := \sup_{0\neq x\in\mathcal{X}} \sup_{0\neq y\in\mathcal{Y}_H} \frac{\mathscr{B}^*(y,x)}{\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}\|y\|_{\mathcal{Y}_H}} \leq \sqrt{2\max\{1, M_a^2\} + M_e^2},$$
$$c_B := \inf_{0\neq x\in\mathcal{X}} \sup_{0\neq y\in\mathcal{Y}_H} \frac{\mathscr{B}^*(y,x)}{\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}\|y\|_{\mathcal{Y}_H}} \geq \frac{\alpha \min\{M_a^{-2}, 1\}}{\sqrt{2\max\{\alpha^{-2}, 1\} + M_e^2}},$$

and that for any $y \in \mathcal{Y}_H$ the following condition is satisfied:

$$\sup_{0\neq x\in\mathcal{X}} \mathscr{B}^*(y,x) \geq \min\{1, \alpha\}\|y\|^2_{\mathcal{Y}_H}.$$

This shows the operator $B^* \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}_H^*)$, associated with $\mathscr{B}^*(\cdot,\cdot)$ via $\mathscr{B}^*(y,x) = {}_{\mathcal{Y}_H}\langle y, B^*x\rangle_{\mathcal{Y}_H^*}$ is boundedly invertible. This, in turn, implies that the operator $B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{Y}_H, \mathcal{X}^*)$ associated with $\mathscr{B}^*(\cdot,\cdot)$ via $\mathscr{B}^*(y,x) = {}_{\mathcal{X}^*}\langle By, x\rangle_{\mathcal{X}}$ is also boundedly invertible, with the same inf-sup constant, see (2.1). Moreover, for $f \in L^2([0,T]; V^*)$ and $u_0 \in H$, we have $\mathscr{F} \in \mathcal{X}^*$. Hence, (2.11) is well-posed.

Once existence and uniqueness of the solution are granted, one can then be interested in having a Petrov-Galerkin approximation of it, as mentioned before. A possible idea to derive a numerical scheme for the weak formulation can be found, for example, in the first paragraphs of [UP12]. We explain it here by introducing families of finite-dimensional subspaces ${}^s\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{X}$ and ${}^s\mathcal{Y}_H \subset \mathcal{Y}_H$ and assuming that V is a function space over a spatial domain Λ. Given a triangulation $\mathcal{T}_h$ in space and a triangulation $\mathcal{T}_k$ in time, $\mathcal{T}_k = \{t_i := ik < t \leq (i+1)k =: t_{i+1},\ i = 0, \dots, N-1\}$, S_k and Q_k are spaces of piecewise linear, respectively, constant functions, with respect to $\mathcal{T}_k$, while V_h is the space of piecewise linear functions with respect to $\mathcal{T}_h$. By setting ${}^s\mathcal{X} = S_k \otimes V_h$, ${}^s\mathcal{Y} = Q_k \otimes V_h$, ${}^s\mathcal{Y}_H = {}^s\mathcal{Y} \oplus V_h$, the finite-dimensional problem becomes

$$\tilde{u} \in {}^s\mathcal{Y}_H : \mathscr{B}^*(\tilde{u}, x) = \mathscr{F}(x), \quad \forall x \in {}^s\mathcal{X}. \tag{2.13}$$

The chosen spaces are both finite-dimensional, hence it suffices to prove that condition (BNB1d) holds. This can be done, for example by endowing the space $\mathcal{X}$ with a new norm defined as $\|x\|^2_{\mathcal{X},k} = \|\dot{x}\|^2_{L^2([0,T];V^*)} + \|\bar{x}\|^2_{L^2([0,T];V)}$, where $\bar{x}$ is the orthogonal projection of x onto the space $Q_k \otimes V \subset \mathcal{Y}$, obtaining that the discrete inf-sup constant actually coincides with the one obtained with full spaces. Quasi-optimality can thus be exploited and error estimates can be achieved by estimating the best error with the interpolation error. Further development of the quasi-optimality theory can be found in [Tan13].

3. A weak space-time formulation of the stochastic problem

In order to introduce the weak space-time formulation for the equation (1.1) we will follow the idea outlined in Section 2.2. Keeping the same notation introduced in the previous sections, consider the spaces

$$\mathbb{X} := L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{X}), \quad \mathbb{Y} := L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{Y}), \qquad \mathbb{H} := L^2(\Omega;H), \qquad \mathbb{Y}_{\mathbb{H}} := \mathbb{Y}\times\mathbb{H},$$

endowed with their respective natural norms, with the further assumptions that the processes in $\mathbb{X}$ and in $\mathbb{Y}$ are assumed to be predictable and the elements in $\mathbb{H}$ are assumed to be Σ_0-measurable. In this new framework there is an equivalent to the dense embedding of $\mathcal{X}\hookrightarrow\mathscr{C}([0,T];H)$. Indeed, referring to the result in (2.6), there exists an absolute constant M_e such that $\|x\|_{\mathscr{C}([0,T];H)}\leq M_e\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}, x\in\mathbb{X}$. Taking the expectation on both sides gives that, for every $x\in\mathbb{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|x\|^2_{\mathscr{C}([0,T];\mathbb{H})} &:= \sup_{t\in[0,T]}\mathbb{E}\Big[\|x(t)\|_H^2\Big] \leq \mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|x(t)\|_H^2\Big]\\ &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\|x\|^2_{\mathscr{C}([0,T];H)}\Big] \leq M_e^2\mathbb{E}\Big[\|x\|^2_{\mathcal{X}}\Big] = M_e^2\|x\|^2_{\mathbb{X}},\end{aligned}$$

proving the claim.

We assume that the operator A is as in Section 1, i.e., that it satisfies the following conditions for some positive numbers α, M_a:

(Boundedness) $\quad |a(t,\omega;u,v)|\leq M_a\|u\|_V\|v\|_V, \quad t\in[0,T],\ \omega\in\Omega, u,v\in V,$

(Coercivity) $\quad a(t,\omega;v,v)\geq\alpha\|v\|_V^2, \qquad t\in[0,T],\ \omega\in\Omega, v\in V.$

We introduce the new bilinear form $\mathfrak{B}^*$ defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathfrak{B}^*\colon \mathbb{Y}_{\mathbb{H}}\times\mathbb{X}\to\mathbb{R},\\ &\mathfrak{B}^*(y,x) := \mathbb{E}[\mathscr{B}^*(y,x)],\end{aligned}$$

or, explicitly,

$$\mathfrak{B}^*(y,x) := \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^T \Big({}_{V^*}\langle y_1(t), -\dot{x}(t)\rangle_V + a(t;y_1(t),x(t))\Big)\,\mathrm{d}t + \langle y_2, x(T)\rangle_H\Big],$$

and the new load functional $\mathfrak{W}$ defined as,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathfrak{W}\colon \mathbb{X}\to\mathbb{R},\\ &\mathfrak{W}(x) := \mathfrak{F} + \widetilde{\mathfrak{W}},\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{F}(x) &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^T {}_{V^*}\langle f(t), x(t)\rangle_V\,\mathrm{d}t + \langle U_0, x(0)\rangle_H\Big],\\ \widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}(x) &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^T \langle\,\mathrm{d}W(t), x(t)\rangle_H\Big].\end{aligned}$$

The second weak space-time formulation reads hence

$$U\in\mathbb{Y}_{\mathbb{H}}\colon \mathfrak{B}^*(U,x) = \mathfrak{W}(x), \quad \forall x\in\mathbb{X}. \tag{3.1}$$

Provided that the bilinear form $\mathfrak{B}^*(\cdot,\cdot)$ is bounded, in order to solve such a problem we need to prove that the operator $B\in\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{Y}_{\mathbb{H}},\mathbb{X}^*)$ associated to $\mathfrak{B}^*(\cdot,\cdot)$ via $\mathfrak{B}^*(y,x) = {}_{\mathbb{X}^*}\langle By,x\rangle_{\mathbb{X}}$ is boundedly invertible. As already pointed out, this is equivalent to proving that the adjoint operator $B^*\in\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{X},\mathbb{Y}_{\mathbb{H}}^*)$ is boundedly invertible, which, in turn, is equivalent to the fulfilment of the conditions (BNB1) and

(BNB2), see below. Furthermore, if $\mathfrak{W} \in \mathbb{X}^*$, it then holds that $\|U\|_{\mathbb{Y}_\mathbb{H}} \leq \frac{1}{c_B}\|\mathfrak{W}\|_{\mathbb{X}^*}$, where the inf-sup constant c_B does not depend on t or ω.

In order to prove this we will extensively use the analogous results for the deterministic bilinear form $\mathscr{B}^*(\cdot,\cdot)$ defined in (2.10) for the weak space-time formulation and the proofs present in the references mentioned in Section 2. Notice that from now on we will use $\lesssim$ whenever the hidden constants are purely numerical factors. Moreover, whenever this is deducible from the context and does not lead to ambiguity, we will suppress $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. from the notation.

The first step is to prove that the bilinear form is bounded, i.e., to verify hypothesis (BDD). This follows easily from the boundedness of the deterministic bilinear form:

$$|\mathfrak{B}^*(y,x)| = |\mathbb{E}\big[\mathscr{B}^*(y,x)\big]| \lesssim \mathbb{E}\big[\|y\|_{\mathcal{Y}_H}\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}\big] \leq \|x\|_{\mathbb{Y}_\mathbb{H}}\|x\|_{\mathbb{X}}.$$

To prove that the condition (BNB1) holds, i.e.,

$$\inf_{0\neq x\in\mathbb{X}} \sup_{0\neq y\in\mathbb{Y}_\mathbb{H}} \frac{\mathfrak{B}^*(y,x)}{\|x\|_{\mathbb{X}}\|y\|_{\mathbb{Y}_\mathbb{H}}} \geq c_B,$$

it suffices to show that

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{X},\ \exists y_x \in \mathbb{Y} : \mathfrak{B}^*(y_x,x) \gtrsim \|y_x\|_{\mathbb{Y}_\mathbb{H}}\|x\|_{\mathbb{X}}.$$

By defining $y_x = (z_x + x, x(T))$, where $z_x = -A^{-1}\dot{x}$ and $\dot{x} = -Az_x$, we have a trial function that is predictable and clearly belongs to the space $\mathbb{Y}_\mathbb{H}$, and that satisfies $\|y_x\|_{\mathcal{Y}_H} \lesssim \|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., which in turn implies $\|y_x\|_{\mathbb{Y}_\mathbb{H}} \lesssim \|x\|_{\mathbb{X}}$. Using the fact that

$$\mathscr{B}^*(y_x,x) \gtrsim \|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

by taking the expectation on both sides we obtain

$$\mathfrak{B}^*(y_x,x) \gtrsim \|x\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 \gtrsim \|x\|_{\mathbb{X}}\|y_x\|_{\mathbb{Y}_\mathbb{H}},$$

which proves the claim. The constants suppressed in these estimates are the same as in Section 2.

For the proof of the condition (BNB2), i.e.,

$$\sup_{0\neq x\in\mathbb{X}} \mathfrak{B}^*(y,x) > 0, \quad \text{for any } y \in \mathbb{Y}_\mathbb{H},$$

we know, by using the proof in [SS09] and adapting it to this framework, that for any $y \in \mathbb{Y}_\mathbb{H}$, $y \neq 0$, there is $z \in \mathbb{X}$ such that

$$\mathscr{B}^*(y,z) = \int_0^T a(t;y_1,y_1)\,\mathrm{d}t + \langle y_2, y_2\rangle_H, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}.$$

By taking the expectation on both sides and by using the coercivity of A it follows that

$$\mathfrak{B}^*(y,z) \gtrsim \|y\|_{\mathbb{Y}_\mathbb{H}}^2,$$

and the claim follows by noticing that

$$\forall y \in \mathbb{Y}_\mathbb{H},\ \sup_{x\in\mathbb{X}} \mathfrak{B}^*(y,x) \geq \mathfrak{B}^*(y,z) \gtrsim \|y\|_{\mathbb{Y}_\mathbb{H}}^2 > 0.$$

Focusing now on the right-hand side, we assume that $f \in \mathbb{Y}^*$ and that $U_0 \in \mathbb{H}$. Then, for $x \in \mathbb{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathfrak{F}(x)| &= \Big|\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^T {}_{V^*}\langle f(t), x(t)\rangle_V \,\mathrm{d}t + \langle U_0, x(0)\rangle_H\Big]\Big| \\
&\le \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\int_0^T \|f(t)\|_{V^*}^2 \,\mathrm{d}t\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big(\int_0^T \|x(t)\|_V{}^2 \,\mathrm{d}t\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big] + \mathbb{E}\big[\|U_0\|_H^2\big]^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbb{E}\big[\|x(0)^2\|_H\big]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\lesssim \|f\|_{\mathbb{Y}^*}\|x\|_{\mathbb{Y}} + \|U_0\|_{\mathbb{H}}\|x\|_{\mathbb{X}} \\
&\le \|x\|_{\mathbb{X}}(\|f\|_{\mathbb{Y}^*} + \|U_0\|_{\mathbb{H}}),
\end{aligned}$$

showing that $\mathfrak{F} \in \mathbb{X}^*$ if $U_0 \in \mathbb{H}$ and $f \in \mathbb{Y}^*$.

The final step is then to show that $\widetilde{\mathfrak{W}} \in \mathbb{X}^*$. The weak stochastic integral we are using is defined as

$$\int_0^T \langle \,\mathrm{d}W(t), x(t)\rangle_H := \int_0^T \tilde{I}_x(t)\,\mathrm{d}W(t),$$

where the test functions $x \in \mathbb{X}$ are continuous Σ_t-adapted, hence predictable, H-valued processes and where $\tilde{I}_x : \Omega \times [0,T] \to \mathscr{L}_2(H_0, \mathbb{R})$ is defined as $\tilde{I}_x(t)u := \langle u, x(t)\rangle_H$ for any $u \in H$, with $H_0 = Q^{\frac{1}{2}}H$. The integral on the right-hand side is the H-valued Ito integral. For more details the reader can refer to [PR07, Chapt. 2].

It holds in particular that, by denoting with $\{e_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ any orthonormal basis of H, for almost every $t \in [0,T]$ and $\omega \in \Omega$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{I}_x(t)\|_{\mathscr{L}_2(H_0,\mathbb{R})}^2 = \|\tilde{I}_x(t)Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathscr{L}_2(H,\mathbb{R})}^2 &= \sum_{k=1}^\infty |\tilde{I}_x(t)Q^{\frac{1}{2}}e_k|^2 \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^\infty |\langle x(t), Q^{\frac{1}{2}}e_k\rangle_H|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^\infty |{}_V\langle x(t), Q^{\frac{1}{2}}e_k\rangle_{V^*}|^2 \\
&\le \|x(t)\|_V^2 \sum_{k=1}^\infty \|Q^{\frac{1}{2}}e_k\|_{V^*}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

leading to

$$\|\tilde{I}_x(t)\|_{\mathscr{L}_2(H_0,\mathbb{R})} \le \|x(t)\|_V \|Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathscr{L}_2(H,V^*)}, \quad \mathrm{d}t \otimes \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \tag{3.2}$$

This, together with Ito's isometry, gives that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}(x)| = \Big|\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^T \tilde{I}_x(t)\,\mathrm{d}W(t)\Big]\Big| &\le \Big(\mathbb{E}\Big|\int_0^T \tilde{I}_x(t)\,\mathrm{d}W(t)\Big|^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \Big(\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^T \|\tilde{I}_x(t)\|_{\mathscr{L}_2(H_0,\mathbb{R})}^2 \,\mathrm{d}t\Big]\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le \|Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathscr{L}_2(H,V^*)}\|x\|_{\mathbb{Y}},
\end{aligned}$$

leading to

$$\|\widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}\|_{\mathbb{X}^*} \le \|Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathscr{L}_2(H,V^*)},$$

proving that $\widetilde{\mathfrak{W}} \in \mathbb{X}^*$ if $Q^{\frac{1}{2}} \in \mathscr{L}_2(H, V^*)$. Putting together the results presented above, results in the following theorem follows:

Theorem 3 (Existence and uniqueness)**.** *If $U_0 \in \mathbb{H}$, $f \in \mathbb{Y}^*$ and $Q^{\frac{1}{2}} \in \mathscr{L}_2(H, V^*)$, then there exists a unique solution $U \in \mathbb{Y}_{\mathbb{H}}$ to the problem* (3.1)*. It is bounded by*

$$\|U\|_{\mathbb{Y}_{\mathbb{H}}} \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathbb{Y}^*} + \|U_0\|_{\mathbb{H}} + \|Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathscr{L}_2(H,V^*)}, \tag{3.3}$$

or, when expanded,

(3.4)
$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^T \|U_1(t)\|_V^2 \,\mathrm{d}t + \|U_2\|_H^2\Big] \lesssim \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^T \|f(t)\|_{V^*}^2 \,\mathrm{d}t + \|U_0\|_H^2\Big] + \|Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathscr{L}_2(H,V^*)}^2.$$

Remark 4. *Notice that the assumption on $Q^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is now weaker than the assumption $Q^{\frac{1}{2}} \in \mathscr{L}_2(H)$, used in the definition of variational solution in Definition 2. We therefore get the same regularity as in the variational solution, but under a weaker assumption on Q. However, our result is consistent with $\beta = 0$ in* (1.4) *for the mild solution. See Section 5 for further discussion.*

Remark 5. *The modified problem*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{d}U(t) + A(t)U(t)\,\mathrm{d}t = f(t)\,\mathrm{d}t + B\,\mathrm{d}W(t), \quad t \in (0,T], \\ &U(0) = U_0, \end{aligned}$$

where $B \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ can be treated in the same way, by using the fact that the space $\mathcal{L}_2(H)$ of Hilbert-Schmidt operators forms a two-sided ideal in the Banach algebra of bounded operators on H. Indeed, by defining $\widetilde{Q} = BQB^*$, we can consider a $\widetilde{Q}$-Wiener process $\widetilde{W}$, substitute $\mathrm{d}W$ with $\mathrm{d}\widetilde{W}$ in the equation (1.1) *and proceed as before.*

4. Properties of the solution

It is now interesting to find a connection between the solution presented here and the other concepts of solution previously introduced. To this end, an important role is played by the second component U_2 of the solution $U = (U_1, U_2)$, which turns out to be a continuous H-valued process, once regarded as a function of the final time T.

4.1. Connection with the variational solution.

For $0 \le a < b \le T$, we introduce the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{Y}_a^b = L^2(\Omega; L^2([a,b];V)), \quad y \in \mathbb{Y}_a^b \times \mathbb{H}, \\ &\mathbb{X}_a^b = L^2(\Omega; L^2([a,b];V) \cap H_0^1((a,b);V^*)), \quad x \in \mathbb{X}_a^b, \quad \xi_a \in \mathbb{H}, \\ &\mathfrak{W}_a^b(\xi_a, x) = \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_a^b {}_{V^*}\langle f(t), x(t)\rangle_V \,\mathrm{d}t + \int_a^b \langle \mathrm{d}W(t), x(t)\rangle_H + \langle \xi_a, x(a)\rangle_H\Big], \\ &\mathfrak{B}_a^b(y, x) = \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_a^b {}_{V^*}\langle y_1(t), -\dot{x}(t) + A(t)^* x(t)\rangle_V \,\mathrm{d}t + \langle y_2, x(b)\rangle_H\Big], \end{aligned}$$

with the measurability assumptions previously introduced. It follows immediately that with this choice of spaces the bilinear form $\mathfrak{B}_a^b$ is bounded and satisfies the conditions (BNB1) and (BNB2), with constants independent of the choice of time interval $[a,b]$.

In the next theorem we split the time interval $[0,T]$ into two sub-intervals, i.e., into $[0,t]$ and $[t,T]$, and show that the second component of the solution to the problem solved on $[0,t]$ is a function of $t \in [0,T]$.

Theorem 6. *Let $U_0 \in \mathbb{H}$, $f \in (\mathbb{Y}_0^T)^*$, $t \in [0,T]$, and assume that U and V are solutions to the following problems:*

$$U = (U_1, U_2) \in \mathbb{Y}_0^t \times \mathbb{H} : \mathfrak{B}_0^t(U, x) = \mathfrak{W}_0^t(U_0, x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{X}_0^t, \tag{4.1}$$

and

$$V = (V_1, V_2) \in \mathbb{Y}_t^T \times \mathbb{H} : \mathfrak{B}_t^T(V, x) = \mathfrak{W}_t^T(U_2, x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{X}_t^T. \tag{4.2}$$

A process $Z = (Z_1, Z_2)$*, defined as*

$$Z_1 \overset{\mathbb{Y}_0^t}{=} U_1, \qquad Z_1 \overset{\mathbb{Y}_t^T}{=} V_1, \qquad Z_2 \overset{\mathbb{H}}{=} V_2, \tag{4.3}$$

is then the unique solution to the problem

$$Z = (Z_1, Z_2) \in \mathbb{Y}_0^T \times \mathbb{H} : \mathfrak{B}_0^T(Z, x) = \mathfrak{W}_0^T(U_0, x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{X}_0^T. \tag{4.4}$$

Conversely, if Z *is a solution to* (4.4)*, then for any* $t \in [0, T]$ *there exists a unique* $U_2(t) \in \mathbb{H}$ *such that*

$$U = (U_1, U_2(t)) \in \mathbb{Y}_0^t \times \mathbb{H} : \mathfrak{B}_0^t(U, x) = \mathfrak{W}_0^t(U_0, x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{X}_0^t, \tag{4.5}$$

where U_1 *is the restriction of* Z_1 *to* $\mathbb{Y}_0^t$*.*

Proof. Notice first that since, by restriction, $\mathbb{X}_0^T \subset \mathbb{X}_0^t$ and $\mathbb{X}_0^T \subset \mathbb{X}_t^T$, we may substitute $x \in \mathbb{X}_0^T$ in the problems (4.1), (4.2), and (4.4). Moreover, the process Z in (4.3) clearly belongs to $\mathbb{Y}_0^T \times \mathbb{H}$. The proof follows now from a simple decomposition: indeed, given Z as above, for any $x \in \mathbb{X}_0^T$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{B}_0^T(Z, x) &= \mathfrak{B}_0^t(U, x) + \mathfrak{B}_t^T(V, x) - \mathbb{E}[\langle U_2, x(t)\rangle_H] \\ &= \mathfrak{W}_0^t(U_0, x) + \mathfrak{W}_t^T(U_2, x) - \mathbb{E}[\langle U_2, x(t)\rangle_H] \\ &= \mathfrak{W}_0^T(U_0, x).\end{aligned}$$

Thus the first part of the theorem holds. Similarly, by a uniqueness argument, the converse follows. □

It is thus meaningful to think of the second component of the weak space-time solution as a function of time, writing hence

$$U = (U_1, U_2(t)) \in \mathbb{Y}_0^t \times \mathbb{H} : \mathfrak{B}_0^t(U, x) = \mathfrak{W}_0^t(U_0, x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{X}_0^t.$$

Moreover, assume that for any $t \in [0, T]$ the weak space-time solution to (3.1) on the time interval $[0, t] \subset [0, T]$ is given by $(U_1(\cdot), U_2(t)) \in \mathbb{Y}_0^t \times \mathbb{H}$. Then one can choose test functions $x \in \mathbb{X}_0^t$ that are constant in time, i.e., $x(s) \equiv \xi \in L^2(\Omega; V)$, $s \in [0, t]$. Hence, for any $\xi \in L^2(\Omega; V)$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^t {}_{V^*}\langle A(s)U_1(s), \xi\rangle_V \,\mathrm{d}s + \langle U_2(t), \xi\rangle_H\Big] \\ &\qquad = \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^t {}_{V^*}\langle f(s), \xi\rangle_V \,\mathrm{d}s + \langle U_0, \xi\rangle_H + \int_0^t \langle \,\mathrm{d}W(s), \xi\rangle_H\Big],\end{aligned}$$

which can be rewritten as

$${}_{L^2(\Omega;V^*)}\Big\langle U_2(t) - \Big(U_0 - \int_0^t A(s)U_1(s)\,\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t f(s)\,\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \mathrm{d}W(s)\Big), \xi\Big\rangle_{L^2(\Omega;V)} = 0,$$

which implies

$$U_2(t) \overset{L^2(\Omega;V^*)}{=} U_0 - \int_0^t A(s)U_1(s)\,\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t f(s)\,\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \mathrm{d}W(s),$$

and

$$U_2(t) \overset{V^*}{=} U_0 - \int_0^t A(s)U_1(s)\,\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t f(s)\,\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \mathrm{d}W(s), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

yielding the continuity of U_2 as a V^*-valued function of time.

We conclude that the second component of the solution is a continuous H-valued progressively measurable $\mathrm{d}t \otimes \mathbb{P}$ version of the first component (one can see this fact even by direct computation whenever A does not depend on t or ω, as pointed out in Remark 8 below).

These results clarify the connection between the second weak space-time solution and the variational solution in Definition 2. Moreover, we can now rely on the theory in [PR07] to derive further properties for U_2, e.g., that it is continuous as an H-valued progressively measurable process.

4.2. **Connection with the mild solution.** Assume in the following that $-A$ is independent of t and ω and hence generates an analytic semigroup $(S(t))_{t\geq 0}$. Then the following theorem holds:

Theorem 7. *Let U be the mild solution* (1.3) *to the problem* (1.1) *and assume that $(U_1, U_2(t)) \in \mathbb{Y}_0^t \times \mathbb{H}$ is the weak space-time solution to the same problem. Then, for any $t \in [0,T]$, $U_1 \overset{\mathbb{Y}_0^t}{=} U$ and $U_2(t) \overset{\mathbb{H}}{=} U(t)$.*

Proof. For any $t \in [0,T]$ and for any $x \in \mathbb{X}_0^t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^t ({}_V\langle U_1(s), -\dot{x}(s) + A^*x(s)\rangle_{V^*})\,\mathrm{d}s + \langle U_2(t), x(t)\rangle_H\Big] \\ &\qquad = \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^t {}_{V^*}\langle f(s), x(s)\rangle_V\,\mathrm{d}s + \langle U_0, x(0)\rangle_H + \int_0^t \langle\,\mathrm{d}W(s), x(s)\rangle_H\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

We choose the test function $x = \psi \otimes v$, where $\psi \in L^2(\Omega)$ is arbitrary and $v \in \mathcal{X}_0^t$ is the solution to the deterministic backward equation (2.8) over the time interval $[0,t]$, with arbitrary final data ξ_t and load function g. Its variational formulation is (2.9),

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^t {}_V\langle y_1(s), -\dot{v}(s) + A^*v(s)\rangle_{V^*}\,\mathrm{d}s + \langle y_2, v(t)\rangle_H \\ &\qquad = \int_0^t {}_V\langle y_1(s), g(s)\rangle_{V^*}\,\mathrm{d}s + \langle y_2, \xi_t\rangle_H, \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

for all $y \in \mathcal{Y}_H$. The solution is given by the mild formula

$$v(s) = S^*(t-s)\xi_t + \int_s^t S^*(r-s)g(r)\,\mathrm{d}r, \quad s \in [0,t], \tag{4.8}$$

where S^* is the semigroup generated by $-A^*$, namely $S^*(s) = e^{-sA^*}$. By substituting $x = \psi \otimes v$ in (4.6) and $y = (U_1, U_2)$ in (4.7), multiplying by ψ and taking the expectation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\int_0^t {}_V\langle U_1(s), g(s)\rangle_{V^*}\,\mathrm{d}s + \langle U_2(t), \xi_t\rangle_H\Big)\psi\Big] \\ &\quad = \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\int_0^t {}_{V^*}\langle f(s), v(s)\rangle_V\,\psi\,\mathrm{d}s + \langle U_0, v(0)\rangle_H\,\psi + \int_0^t \langle\,\mathrm{d}W(s), v(s)\rangle_H\,\psi\Big)\Big], \end{aligned}$$

which, by (4.8) is in turn equal to

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\int_0^t {}_{V^*}\langle f(s), S^*(t-s)\xi_t\rangle_V \,\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t {}_{V^*}\Big\langle f(s), \int_s^t S^*(r-s)g(r)\,\mathrm{d}r\Big\rangle_V \,\mathrm{d}s \\
&\quad + \langle U_0, S^*(t)\xi_t\rangle_H + \Big\langle U_0, \int_s^t S^*(r-s)g(r)\,\mathrm{d}r\Big\rangle_H \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \langle\, \mathrm{d}W(s), S^*(t-s)\xi_t\rangle_H + \int_0^t \Big\langle \mathrm{d}W(s), \int_s^t S^*(r-s)g(r)\,\mathrm{d}r\Big\rangle_H\Big)\psi\Big].
\end{aligned}
$$

By manipulating the dual pairings in a suitable way, changing the order of integration (using the stochastic version of Fubini's theorem), and using the mild solution formula (1.3), we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^t {}_V\langle U_1(s), \psi g(s)\rangle_{V^*}\,\mathrm{d}s + \langle U_2(t), \psi\xi_t\rangle_H\Big] \\
&\quad = \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\langle S(t)U_0 + \int_0^t S(t-s)f(s)\,\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t S(t-s)\,\mathrm{d}W(s), \psi\xi_t\Big\rangle_H \\
&\qquad + \int_0^t {}_V\Big\langle S(s)U_0 + \int_0^s S(s-r)f(r)\,\mathrm{d}r + \int_0^s S(s-r)\,\mathrm{d}W(r), \psi g(s)\Big\rangle_{V^*}\,\mathrm{d}s\Big], \\
&\quad = \mathbb{E}\Big[\langle U(t), \psi\xi_t\rangle_H + \int_0^t {}_V\langle U(s), \psi g(s)\rangle_{V^*}\,\mathrm{d}s\Big],
\end{aligned}
$$

which reads

$$
{}_{\mathbb{Y}}\langle U_1 - U, \psi g\rangle_{\mathbb{Y}^*} + \langle U_2(t) - U(t), \psi\xi_t\rangle_{\mathbb{H}} = 0.
$$

Since (g, ξ_t) is arbitrary in $L^2([0,t]; V^*) \times H$, ψ is arbitrary in $L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$, and $L^2(\Omega)\otimes\mathcal{X}_0^t$ is dense in $\mathbb{X}_0^t$, it follows that

$$
U_1 \overset{\mathbb{Y}_0^t}{=} U, \quad U_2(t) \overset{\mathbb{H}}{=} U(t), \quad t \in [0,T].
$$

□

Remark 8. *This implies that U_1 is a V-valued version of U_2 and that U_2 is a continuous H-valued function of time. Moreover, in the same way as in* [DPZ92, KF01] *we can also derive a connection to the weak solution* (1.2)*. We omit the details.*

5. Regularity

As explained before, it is possible to switch from the Gelfand triple setting to the semigroup setting whenever A is independent of t and ω. Moreover, the semigroup $S(t) = \mathrm{e}^{-tA}$ is analytic and fractional powers of A are well defined. Define $\dot{H}^\beta$ as the domain of $(A)^{\frac{\beta}{2}}$ and consider the spaces

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Y}^\beta &:= L^2([0,T]; \dot{H}^{\beta+1}), \\
\mathcal{X}^\beta &:= L^2([0,T]; \dot{H}^{1-\beta}) \cap H^1((0,T); \dot{H}^{-1-\beta}),
\end{aligned}
$$

normed by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|y\|_{\mathcal{Y}^\beta}^2 &:= \int_0^T \|A^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}} y\|_H^2 \,\mathrm{d}t, \\
\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}^\beta}^2 &:= \int_0^T (\|A^{\frac{1-\beta}{2}} x\|_H^2 + \|A^{-\frac{1+\beta}{2}}\dot{x}\|_H^2)\,\mathrm{d}t.
\end{aligned}
$$

The spaces in the previous sections correspond to $\beta = 0$. The space $\mathcal{Y}^\beta \times \dot{H}^\beta$ endowed with its product norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Y}^\beta \times \dot{H}^\beta}$ and the space $\mathcal{X}^\beta$ endowed with the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{X}^\beta}$-norm are Hilbert spaces. As before, there is a dense embedding $\mathcal{X}^\beta \hookrightarrow \mathscr{C}([0,T];\dot{H}^{-\beta})$, i.e., $\|A^{-\frac{\beta}{2}}x\|_{\mathscr{C}([0,T];\dot{H}^{-\beta})} \lesssim \|x\|_{\mathcal{X}^\beta}$ for any $x \in \mathcal{X}^\beta$, where, again, the underlying constant is uniform in the choice of V. A proof of this fact can be found in [DL92, Lun09], and relies on the properties of the interpolating space $(\dot{H}^{1-\beta}, \dot{H}^{-1-\beta})_{\frac{1}{2}} = \dot{H}^{-\beta}$. Define now the spaces

$$\mathbb{X}^\beta := L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{X}^\beta), \quad \mathbb{Y}^\beta := L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{Y}^\beta), \quad \mathbb{H}^\beta := L^2(\Omega;\dot{H}^\beta),$$

endowed with their natural norms. It follows directly that there is still a dense embedding $\mathbb{X}^\beta \hookrightarrow \mathscr{C}([0,T];\mathbb{H}^{-\beta})$. A new bilinear form is introduced,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{B}^*_\beta &\colon (\mathbb{Y}^\beta \times \mathbb{H}^\beta) \times \mathbb{X}^\beta \to \mathbb{R},\\ \mathfrak{B}^*_\beta(y,x) &:= \mathbb{E}[\mathscr{B}^*_\beta(y,x)],\end{aligned}$$

together with a new load functional,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{W}_\beta &\colon \mathbb{X}^\beta \to \mathbb{R},\\ \mathfrak{W}_\beta(x) &:= \mathfrak{F}_\beta(x) + \widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}_\beta(x),\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathfrak{B}^*_\beta(y,x)$, $\mathfrak{F}_\beta(x)$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}_\beta(x)$ are defined as in the previous section, but on the new domains introduced above. The weak space-time formulation reads hence

$$U_\beta \in \mathbb{Y}^\beta \times \mathbb{H}^\beta \colon \mathfrak{B}^*_\beta(U_\beta, x) = \mathfrak{W}_\beta(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{X}^\beta, \tag{5.1}$$

It is possible to prove that the conditions (BDD), (BNB1) and (BNB2) still hold, with the same constants C_B and c_B as before. The proof of this follows from a straightforward modification of the proof for the deterministic framework in [SS09] or [Tan13], taking in account the remarks made for its extension to the stochastic framework in Section 3. It will therefore be omitted. In the following lemma we give sufficient conditions on the load functional $\mathfrak{W}_\beta$ in order to have a unique solution.

Lemma 9. *With the notation introduced above, the following facts hold true:*

- *If $f \in \mathbb{Y}^{\beta-2}$ and $U_0 \in \mathbb{H}$, then $\mathfrak{F}_\beta \in (\mathbb{X}^\beta)^*$.*
- *If $Q^{\frac{1}{2}} \in \mathscr{L}_2(H;\dot{H}^{\beta-1})$, then $\widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}_\beta \in (\mathbb{X}^\beta)^*$.*

Proof. The first statement is obvious; we prove the second one. By using the same notation and techniques as in Section 3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}|\widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}_\beta(x)| &= \Big|\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^T \tilde{I}_x(t)\,\mathrm{d}W(t)\Big]\Big|\\ &\le \Big(\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^T \|\tilde{I}_x(t)\|^2_{\mathscr{L}_2(H_0,\mathbb{R})}\,\mathrm{d}t\Big]\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\ &\le \|Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathscr{L}_2(H,\dot{H}^{\beta-1})}\|x\|_{L^2(\Omega\times[0,T];\dot{H}^{1-\beta})}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus for $x \in \mathbb{Y}^{-\beta}$ it holds that

$$|\widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}_\beta(x)| \le \|Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathscr{L}_2(H,\dot{H}^{\beta-1})}\|x\|_{\mathbb{Y}^{-\beta}},$$

which means that $\widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}_\beta \in (\mathbb{X}^\beta)^*$. □

The previous lemma, together with the initial remarks about the fulfilment of the conditions (BDD), (BNB1), and (BNB2), gives the following result.

Theorem 10. *Let $\beta \geq 0$. If $U_0 \in \mathbb{H}^\beta$, $f \in \mathbb{Y}^{\beta-2}$, and $Q^{\frac{1}{2}} \in \mathscr{L}_2(H, \dot{H}^{\beta-1})$, then there exists a unique solution $U \in \mathbb{Y}^\beta \times \mathbb{H}^\beta$ to the problem (5.1) and its norm is bounded by*

$$\|U\|_{\mathbb{Y}^\beta \times \mathbb{H}^\beta} \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathbb{Y}^{\beta-2}} + \|U_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^\beta} + \|Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathscr{L}_2(H,\dot{H}^{\beta-1})}. \tag{5.2}$$

which, once expanded, reads

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^T \|A^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}} U_1(t)\|_H^2 \,\mathrm{d}t\Big] + \mathbb{E}[\|A^{\frac{\beta}{2}} U_2\|_H^2] \\
&\quad\lesssim \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^T \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} f(t)\|_H^2 \,\mathrm{d}t\Big] + \mathbb{E}[\|A^{\frac{\beta}{2}} U_0\|_H^2] + \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathscr{L}_2(H)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side of the expression is the same as in (1.4), except for the f-term, whereas on the left-hand side we have one extra term. This provides a new $L^2(\Omega \times [0,T]; \dot{H}^{\beta+1})$ bound for the solution, which cannot be obtained by the semigroup approach.

6. A possible numerical scheme

In this section we outline a possible numerical scheme based on the weak space-time formulation of (1.1), presented in Section 3. We only deal with semidiscretizations, first in space and then in time, presenting a possible way to estimate the discretization error in terms of the best error and of the quasi-optimality constant. We will not go any further with explicit error estimates, nor will we consider a fully discrete scheme. More importantly, we do not discretize Ω.

6.1. **Spatial semidiscretization.** The main reference regarding the theory of quasi-optimality is [Tan13, Chapt. 3]. Here we adapt the same argument to our framework. Consider V_h, finite dimensional subspace of V, the spaces $\mathbb{X}_h := L^2(\Omega; H^1([0,T]; V_h))$ and $\mathbb{Y}_h \times \mathbb{H}_h := L^2(\Omega \times [0,T]; V_h) \times L^2(\Omega; V_h)$ and the bilinear form $\mathfrak{B}^*$ and the load functional $\mathfrak{W}$ restricted to these subspaces. Define the norm

$$\|u\|_{V_h^*} := \sup_{v \in V_h, \|v\|_V = 1} \langle u, v \rangle_H,$$

possible alternative norm for the space V_h regarded as subspace of V^*, where clearly $\|v\|_{V_h^*} \leq \|v\|_{V^*}$. Define $r_h := \sup_{v \in V_h} \frac{\|v\|_{V^*}}{\|v\|_{V_h^*}}$ and denote by P_{V_h} the H-orthogonal projection onto V_h, whose action is given by $\langle P_{V_h} v, u \rangle_H = \langle v, u \rangle_H$, for all $v \in H$ and $u \in V_h$. Such a projection defines also a projection acting on V and can be uniquely extended to a projection acting on V^*; furthermore it can be shown that $\|P_{V_h}\|_{\mathcal{L}(V)} = \|P_{V_h}\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^*)} = r_h$ (see [Tan13, Theorem 3.2]). By endowing $\mathbb{X}_h$ with a new norm, different from the one inherited from $\mathbb{X}$, given by

$$\|x\|_{\mathbb{X}_h} := \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^T \Big(\|x\|_V^2 + \|\dot{x}\|_{V_h^*}^2\Big) \,\mathrm{d}t\Big]^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and by defining a discrete counterpart for the operator A, denoted by A_h and defined by $\langle A_h(t,\omega)v, u \rangle_H := a(t,\omega; v, u)$ for every $v, u \in V_h$, it turns out that the spatial semidiscrete problem

$$\tilde{U} \in \mathbb{Y}_h \times \mathbb{H}_h \colon \mathfrak{B}^*(\tilde{U}, x) = \mathfrak{W}(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{X}_h, \tag{6.1}$$

fulfils the inf-sup condition, with the same constants c_B and C_B. The change of norm in the inf-sup conditions leads to a change of the quasi-optimality constant,

which can be proved to be bounded from below and from above by r_h, up to a numerical constant related to c_B and C_B. The semidiscrete method is thus quasi-optimal and satisfies the estimate

$$\|U-\tilde{U}\|_{\mathbb{Y}\times\mathbb{H}} \lesssim \|P_{V_h}\|_{\mathcal{L}(V)} \inf_{v\in\mathbb{Y}_h\times\mathbb{H}_h} \|U-v\|_{\mathbb{Y}\times\mathbb{H}}. \tag{6.2}$$

It is possible to make assumptions such that $\|P_{V_h}\|_{\mathcal{L}(V)} \le C$ is independent of h, see [BY14]. By expanding the norms in (6.2) and using standard interpolation error estimates, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^T \|U_1-\tilde{U}_1\|_V^2 \,\mathrm{d}t\Big] + \mathbb{E}[\|U_2-\tilde{U}_2\|_H^2] \le Ch^{2\beta}\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^T \|U_1\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta+1}}^2 \,\mathrm{d}t + \mathbb{E}\|U_2\|_{\dot{H}^\beta}^2\Big],$$

which is consistent with the regularity result in Theorem 10.

6.2. **Time discretization.** In order to derive a discretization in time we follow the natural approach of keeping the same variational problem as in Section 3 and choosing two proper subspaces defining the semidiscrete problem. Fix a partition of the time interval $[0,T]$, which we assume for simplicity to be uniform with step-length k, given by $\mathcal{T}_k = \{t_i := ik < t \le (i+1)k =: t_{i+1},\ i=0,\dots,N-1\}$, denote by I_i the interval $[t_i,t_{i+1}]$ and denote by S_k the space of continuous piecewise linear functions with respect to $\mathcal{T}_k$, and Q_k the space of piecewise constant functions for the same partition. Define $\mathbb{Y}_k := Q_k \otimes L^2(\Omega;V)$, and $\mathbb{X}_k := S_k \otimes L^2(\Omega;V)$. Denote the shape functions generating S_k and Q_k, respectively, by $\{\phi_i\}_{i=0}^N$ and $\{\psi_i\}_{i=0}^{N-1}$, where the ϕ_i's are the usual hat functions and the ψ_i's are the characteristic functions $\psi_i = \chi_{[t_i,t_{i+1}]}$.

As before, the problem can be written in variational form as

$$\tilde{U}\in\mathbb{Y}_k\times\mathbb{H}_k\colon \mathfrak{B}^*(\tilde{U},x) = \mathfrak{W}(x), \quad \forall x\in\mathbb{X}_k, \tag{6.3}$$

By adapting the argument in [UP12] to the stochastic semidiscrete case, it is once again possible to prove the inf-sup condition, thus achieving existence and uniqueness of a solution to the problem (6.3). Notice that to do that, and to achieve an inf-sup constant that does not depend on the mesh parameter, we need to modify the norm on $\mathbb{X}$ in a similar way as for the discrete deterministic problem in (6.1), i.e., by defining

$$\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}_k}^2 := \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{I_i} \Big(\|\dot{x}\|_{V^*}^2 + \|\Pi_i x\|_V^2\Big),$$
$$\|x\|_{\mathbb{X}_k}^2 := \mathbb{E}\big[\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}_k}^2\big],$$

where Π_i is locally defined on each I_i by $\Pi_i x = \frac{1}{k}\int_{I_i} x(t)\,\mathrm{d}t$. By using the quasi-optimality theory it is possible to bound the discretization error by

$$\|U-\tilde{U}\|_{\mathbb{Y}\times\mathbb{H}} \le \frac{C_b}{c_b} \inf_{v\in\mathbb{Y}_k\times\mathbb{H}} \|U-v\|_{\mathbb{Y}\times\mathbb{H}}. \tag{6.4}$$

In order to reveal the form of the equations in 6.3, we decompose the semidiscrete solution $\tilde{U}\in\mathbb{Y}_k\times\mathbb{H}$ as

$$\tilde{U} = (\tilde{U}^{(1)},\tilde{U}^{(2)}) = \Big(\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \tilde{U}_i^{(1)}\psi_i, U_N^{(2)}\Big),$$

where $\tilde{U}_i^{(1)} \in L^2(\Omega;V)$, $i=0,\dots,N-1$, and $U_N^{(2)}\in\mathbb{H}$ and take test functions $x=\phi_j\otimes X$, with arbitrary $X\in L^2(\Omega;V)$ such that X is $\Sigma_{t_{j-1}}$-measurable. In the

simplified case when A is independent of time, we derive equations which in the interior nodes coincide with a modification of the Crank-Nicolson scheme,

$$\Big\langle \frac{\tilde{U}_j^{(1)} - \tilde{U}_{j-1}^{(1)}}{k} + \frac{A\tilde{U}_j^{(1)} + A\tilde{U}_{j-1}^{(1)}}{2}, X \Big\rangle = \Big\langle \frac{1}{k}\int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_{j+1}} f\phi_j \,\mathrm{d}t, X \Big\rangle + \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_{j+1}} \langle \,\mathrm{d}W, X\rangle_H \Big],$$

where $\langle\,,\,\rangle$ without subscript denotes the dual pairing in $L^2(\Omega; V)$. In the first node we have instead

$$\Big\langle \frac{\tilde{U}_0^{(1)} - U_0}{k} + \frac{A\tilde{U}_0^{(1)}}{2}, X \Big\rangle = \Big\langle \frac{1}{k}\int_{t_0}^{t_1} f\phi_0 \,\mathrm{d}t, X \Big\rangle + \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{0}^{t_1} \langle \,\mathrm{d}W, X\rangle_H \Big],$$

and in the last node

$$\Big\langle \frac{U_N^2 - \tilde{U}_{N-1}^{(1)}}{k} + \frac{A\tilde{U}_{N-1}^{(1)}}{2}, X \Big\rangle = \Big\langle \frac{1}{k}\int_{t_{N-1}}^{t_N} f\phi_N \,\mathrm{d}t, X \Big\rangle + \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{t_{N-1}}^{t_N} \langle \,\mathrm{d}W, X\rangle_H \Big],$$

for any $X \in L^2(\Omega; V)$.

Remark 11. *Notice that this section is meant to represent only a sketch of how to possibly deal with the numerics in the variational approach here introduced. An alternative approach could be to modify the bilinear form and the right-hand side in order to force the numerical time stepping to become the backward Euler scheme (see* [Tan13] *for the deterministic case). More details for the numerics for the deterministic problem* (2.11) *can also be found in* [Mol13]*, where the results of* [BJ89] *are generalized.*

Appendix A. Connection between the semigroup framework and the variational framework

In this appendix we outline how to switch between the Gelfand triple and semigroup frameworks. This is based on [DL92, Chapt. XVIII.3], [PR07, Appendix F], [KF01], and [CDD+11].

Recall that

$$V \overset{J}{\hookrightarrow} H \overset{\Phi}{\cong} H^* \overset{J^*}{\hookrightarrow} V^*$$

where J and J^* are dense embeddings and Φ is the Riesz isomorphism. We want to modify the operator A introduced above, under the hypothesis that it is deterministic and time-independent, so that it becomes an unbounded operator $\tilde{A}$ from H into H. Define

$$D(A) \subset H = \{v \in V : Av \in J^*\Phi(H)\},$$

and the new operator $\tilde{A}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{A}\colon D(\tilde{A}) \subset H &\to H, \\ D(\tilde{A}) &:= J(D(A)), \\ \tilde{A} &:= \Phi^{-1}(J^*)^{-1}AJ^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

$\tilde{A}$ is thus an unbounded densely defined linear operator, positive definite because of the coercivity of the bilinear form. If the bilinear form $a(\cdot,\cdot)$ associated to A is symmetric and J is a compact embedding, then $\tilde{A}$ is self-adjoint, boundedly invertible, with compact inverse $\tilde{A}^{-1} := JA^{-1}J^*\Phi$, and this implies that we can use the spectral theorem in order to define the semigroup and fractional powers of $\tilde{A}$. Alternatively, we can argue that such an operator is the generator of a strongly

continuous semigroup of contractions and such a semigroup is holomorphic, as outlined in [Ouh05, Theorem 1.52], and it is hence possible to define fractional powers of $\tilde{A}$. In order to simplify the notation, we finally omit the embeddings and denote $\tilde{A}$ by A.

For the other way around, i.e., how to switch from the semigroup framework to the Gelfand triple framework, we refer to [PR07, Appendix F, Remark F.0.6].

References

[BA72] I. Babuška and A. K. Aziz. Survey lectures on the mathematical foundations of the finite element method. In *The Mathematical Foundations of the Finite Element Method with Applications to Partial Differential Equations (Proc. Sympos., Univ. Maryland, Baltimore, Md., 1972)*, pages 1–359. Academic Press, New York, 1972. With the collaboration of G. Fix and R. B. Kellogg.

[BJ89] I. Babuška and T. Janik. The h-p version of the finite element method for parabolic equations. I. The p-version in time. *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations*, 5(4):363–399, 1989.

[BY14] R. E. Bank and H. Yserentant. On the H^1-stability of the L_2-projection onto finite element spaces. *Numer. Math.*, 126(2):361–381, 2014.

[CDD+11] P. A. Cioica, S. Dahlke, N. Döhring, U. Friedrich, S. Kinzel, F. Lindner, T. Raasch, K. Ritter, and R. L. Schilling. On the convergence analysis of Rothe's method. *Edited by AG Numerik/Optimierung*, 2011.

[CS11] N. Chegini and R. Stevenson. Adaptive wavelet schemes for parabolic problems: sparse matrices and numerical results. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 49(1):182–212, 2011.

[DL92] R. Dautray and J. L. Lions. *Mathematical Analysis and Numerical Methods for Science and Technology. Vol. 5*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992. Evolution problems. I, With the collaboration of Michel Artola, Michel Cessenat and Hélène Lanchon, Translated from the French by Alan Craig.

[DPZ92] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Stochastic Equations in Infinite Dimensions*, volume 44 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992.

[EG04] A. Ern and J. L. Guermond. *Theory and Practice of Finite Elements*, volume 159 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2004.

[KF01] C. Knoche and K. Frieler. Solutions of Stochastic Differential Equations in Infinite Dimensional Hilbert Spaces and their Dependence on Initial Data. Diplomarbeit, Fakulät für Mathematik, Universität Bielefeld, 2001.

[Lun09] A. Lunardi. *Interpolation Theory*. Appunti. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (Nuova Serie). [Lecture Notes. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (New Series)]. Edizioni della Normale, Pisa, second edition, 2009.

[Mol13] Ch. Mollet. Stability of Petrov-Galerkin discretizations:application to the space-time weak formulation for parabolic evolution problems. Preprint, 2013.

[Ouh05] E. Ouhabaz. *Analysis of Heat Equations on Domains*, volume 31 of *London Mathematical Society Monographs Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2005.

[PR07] C. Prévôt and M. Röckner. *A Concise Course on Stochastic Partial Differential Equations*, volume 1905 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Berlin, 2007.

[SS09] Ch. Schwab and R. Stevenson. Space-time adaptive wavelet methods for parabolic evolution problems. *Math. Comp.*, 78(267):1293–1318, 2009.

[SS11] Ch. Schwab and E. Süli. Adaptive Galerkin approximation algorithms for partial differential equations in infinite dimensions. Numerical Analysis Technical Report No. 1452, University of Oxford, 2011.

[Tan13] F. Tantardini. Quasi Optimality in the Backward Euler-Galerkin Method for Linear Parabolic Problems. Tesi di dottorato, Universita' degli Studi di Milano, 2013.

[UP12] K. Urban and A. T. Patera. A new error bound for reduced basis approximation of parabolic partial differential equations. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 350(3-4):203–207, 2012.

[XZ03] J. Xu and L. Zikatanov. Some observations on Babuška and Brezzi theories. *Numer. Math.*, 94(1):195–202, 2003.

[Yan04] Y. Yan. Semidiscrete Galerkin approximation for a linear stochastic parabolic partial differential equation driven by an additive noise. *BIT*, 44(4):829–847, 2004.

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Chalmers University of Technology and University of Gothenburg, SE–412 96 Gothenburg, Sweden
E-mail address: stig@chalmers.se

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Chalmers University of Technology and University of Gothenburg, SE–412 96 Gothenburg, Sweden
E-mail address: molteni@chalmers.se